Testimony before the Governmental Administration & Elections Committee of the Connecticut Legislature on HB 6375

My name is Andrew Daniels. I am housing consultant that works in New England and nationally with housing providers and governmental entities on housing policy and programs. This includes policy work for the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development. I was one of the authors of the Final Report of the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing (NCSDPH) as well as several case studies, whose recommendations resulted in the HOPE VI Program, a program which has provided funding in Connecticut to redevelop federal public housing in Stamford, New Haven and Hartford.

I come before the Committee today to speak against the demise of the Housing Sustainability Fund as would occur if HB 6375 is passed as written. The Committee is identified at line 88 (item 41) of the Bill for removal from Connecticut General Statutes.

Not only is the Fund neither a Commission nor Board, but it does not receive any regular annual appropriation, nor therefore does its demise create any cost savings under the stated purpose of the Bill, consolidation of Commissions and Boards. Its inclusion is a convenient addition to a gubernatorial shopping list by those with greater interest in control of an issue and lack of accountability rather than results. In demising the fund, the Governor removes an advisory committee with a mandate to look at the issues of preservation of Connecticut state-aided affordable housing programs and leave the issue in a limbo of bureaucratic discretion.

The Fund requires activities of an Advisory Committee consisting of individuals appointed by legislative leadership and the public housing industry and was intended by the statute that created it a little less than two years ago to take the lead at looking a substantial liability to the State of Connecticut, the underfunding of modernization needs for the over 17,400 units of state-aided housing paid for by the citizens of Connecticut and the potential consequences of disinvestment in an asset whose replacement value not including the cost of land is greater than \$3.3b or an average construction cost of \$190k per unit based on use prevailing wage rates. As a point of comparison, last year CHFA's Board of Commissioners approved 9% Low Income Housing Tax Credit projects with an average cost of new construction over \$300k per unit.

These affordable housing units have been funded through an array of programs that have been in place since the 1950s and which have created a portfolio of housing that is diverse and widely distributed across the State. Attachment A to this testimony is a list of state-aided units that can be found within the communities represented by the member of the GAE Committee. Attachment B is summary of the affordable unit

inventory maintained by the Department of Economic & Community Development (DECD) for each community represented by members of the GAE Committee and the change in percentage if the state-aided units were to be lost to the inventory for that specific community.

These units received grants funded with state bonds for their construction but do not receive any operating subsidy, nor does the legislature appropriate any predictable source of modernization funding. When modernization funding is provided, it is often in the form of a legislative set-aside dedicated to a specific property in a specific community, which means that modernization funding is only available on an *ad hoc* basis and not based on documented needs relative to the entire portfolio nor in consideration of the impact of not funding specific units relative to local community demographics.

While this may seem like a mouthful of marbles it is an important public policy issue as access to governmental affordable housing programs is intimately tied to federal and state fair housing law as well as the Connecticut State Constitution. Given the number of households that fall under one or another of the definitions of protected classes, public polices that result in selective investment or selective disinvestment in government aided housing can result in unintended consequences from a civil rights law perspective.

There is a legal theory that is well established and called *De Facto* demolition, which in plan language means the intuitional abandonment of governmental housing that results in constructive demolition – the units are allowed to fall into such a level of disrepair as to mean that renovation is no longer economically viable when compared to new construction. There is no choice but for the units to be demolished even though a timely intervention of funds would have prevented the loss of economic viability resulting in no need to deprogram and demolish. It was a concern about De Facto Demolition which was one of the major justifications for the HOPE VI Program. If HUD and Congress were not to step up, it was anticipated that the legal services community would force the issue through the courts on a property by property basis using the case law around De Facto Demolition and that the federal government would be making the investments by court order.

This is the legal theory behind the Father Panik law suit and court order that has required one-for-one replacement of the units demolished at the former Father Panik, which was one of the largest public housing developments in Bridgeport and which is still an open issue for the City of Bridgeport and the Bridgeport Housing Authority.

Now there are State bureaucracies that would claim that they have a firm grasp of the problem and are in control of the issue.

I think that if this Committee held hearings today that they would find that these assertions did not contain adequate cloth to cover the claims no matter how they are

fashioned and that some simple questions would quickly uncover the nakedness of these assertions.

DECD which maintains statutory control of the programs has handed over their oversight responsibilities to CHFA as a consequence of the legislation that took \$80m of cash from CHFA as a part of a swap for the equivalent value in the unretired bonds used to financing the state-aided housing portfolio. DECD has no data on this portfolio's physical conditions.

CHFA would claim that they have a sound analysis of the unfunded capital needs of the 17,400 units and they do have a number which changes and shifts depending upon the definitions or the way the question are asked. Their largest number includes the cost of redevelopment of New Britain's Corbin and Pinnacle Heights, which is now estimated at \$90m based on loan application being reviewed at this very moment. The two developments are of the largest in the portfolio and combined are about 5% of the units. Thing is that the \$90m would only bring back 301 units of the current 844 at an average cost of \$299k. If the redevelopment cost estimates for the New Britain properties or others identified as redevelopment are removed, the CHFA estimate drops to roughly \$200m

The funny thing is the CHFA's own requirements for a capital needs assessment (see Attachment C) were not met through the data collection techniques used by CHFA to arrive at an estimate of conventional modernization needs.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has a very large portfolio of state-aided units of the roughly the same construction quality and age. The Massachusetts portfolio receives an operating subsidy and has had a much higher per unit history of appropriation for modernization. Nevertheless, the Massachusetts Department of Housing & Community Development (DHCD) estimates that current modernization levels are roughly 22% of the replacement value of the portfolio. For the Connecticut portfolio that means roughly \$ 726m or almost four time the CHFA estimate. Even if the use of the 22% as a proxy for the lack of a true and current portfolio needs assessment is an overstatement, the CHFA estimate has to be at least half the true need and more likely on 1/3 of true need.

The data collection techniques used by CHFA do not meet national real estate industry standards for capital assessments, and most importantly CHFA would not, by its own standards, underwrite any form of multifamily loan on these assets using the data they have collected.

Oh and by the way, the housing professionals that run the entities that own these 17,400 units, which are public housing agencies, community based non-profits and a small group of for profit owners, would to a clear majority claim that CHFA understates the modernization needs of their housing stock.

As a closing note, I would point out that if one were more interested in harming the Governor, in being partisan, demising the Sustainability Fund at the request of the Governor would provide solid documentation of an intentional disinterest in the analysis and planning required to arrive at a portfolio preservation strategy. In short, it would provide legal advocates with an easy ability to document "institutional neglect" given that a mechanism to address the needs of the portfolio had been created and then was done away with.

The fact remains that 17,400 state-aided housing units exist and are in communities for which every member of this Committee has constituents. The units were funded in such a way that they need a large infusion of capital investment and that "bill" is coming due. Both the current administration and the legislature should want to get out in front of these issues or the issues will come up in another forum, most likely through the courts, and put the State into the awkward position of solving the problem under the leadership a court appointed receiver.

Attachment A

¹ State Housing Projects in Communities Represented by Members of the GAE Committee (by owner type, PHA, NP or FP)

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						······································		·								•	 -	,				-			- 1				
State House	102	102	125	5	5	110	110	5	85	138	\$	88	88	127	127	127	55	149	150	151	86	86	88	118	€	119	5	5	٤
State	12	12	22	24	24	24	74	72	24	24	24	æ	ន	78	82	82	æ	88	98	88	52	12	12	41	4	1,1	4	15	55
109th Congress	es	m	4	5	5	5	æ	s.	S)	5	5	2	2	4	*7	4	4	4	4	4	e e			က	e2	6	3	es	6
Census Tract	1844.00	1844.00	731.00	2106.00	2105,00	2105.00	2104,00	2104.00	2107.00	2107.00	2104.00	6201.00	6301.00	610.00	910.00	810.00	105.00	101.01	105.00	106.00	1901.00	1901.00	1901.00	1503.00	1501.00	1501.00	1503.00	3454.00	3454,00
PMSA Name	New Haven - Meriden	New Haven - Meriden	Bridgeport	Danbury	Danbury	Danbury	Danbury	Danbury	Danbury	Danbury	Danbury	Southern Middlesex Cty	Southern Middlesex Cty	Bridgeport	Bridgeport	Bridgaport	Stamford - Norwalk	Stamford - Norwalk	Stanford - Norwalk	Stamford - Norwalk	New Haven - Meriden	New Haven - Meriden	New Haven - Meriden	Milford-Ansonia- Saymour 1503.00	Milford-Ansonia- Saymour	Milford-Ansonia- Seymour 1501.00	Milford-Ansonia- Saymour 1503,00	Waterbury	Waterbury
County	NEW HAVEN	NEW HAVEN	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	MIDDLESEX	MIDDLESEX	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	NEW HAVEN	NEW HAVEN	NEW HAVEN	NEW HAVEN	NEW HAVEN	NEW HAVEN	NEW HAVEN	NEW HAVEN	NEW HAVEN
5B.R																													
R 48R		_	_							12				-											-				
8 3 8 8					_						7	-						55	54	မ	-				,			-	\dashv
R 288					-,		34		31		8							99	108	55		\dashv							
78 1BR	12	5	24	\$	8	5	8	6	\$			88	e¢.	æ	9	. ex	32	2	12	7	0	5	- 80	4	8	æ	ဗ		4
9 A80	38	8		₽	*	6				-			82	12	ထ	82	9				ន	8	12		17	24		36	38
is Bidg	4	es	-	12	12	-	57	88	88				은	ဖ	ιn	Os.		6	89	z,	12	9	- 5	ક	9	æ	2	-	=
# of Units	8	4	24	SS	SS.	ŝ	114	65	115	12	72	88	ဗွ	50	==	8	51	8	144	21	40	8	20	40	25	04	ន	36	88
Occup. Date	11/02/1974	12/11/1985	12/15/1995	2/1/1/975	07/01/1962	02/15/1967	2/1/1953	771/1950	2/15/1951	472/1857		5/10/1993	08/01/1985	09/29/1967	06/01/1973	10/14/1981	10/18/1988	10/1/1949	9/29/1951	11/1/1988	05/01/1985	09/30/1971	10/01/1975	01/01/1991	09/01/1969	05/28/1974	03/15/1983	10/25/1993	07/01/1964
Program	Elderly	Elderly	Elderly	Elderly	Elderly	Elderly	Mod Rental	Mod Rental	Mod Rental	Mod Rental	Mod Rental Sec 8 Rehab	Elderly	Elderly	Elderly	Elderly	Elderly Section 8	Elderly	Mod Rental	Mod Rental	Mod Rental	Elderly	Elderly	Elderly	Elderly	Elderly	Elderly	Elderly	Congregate	Elderly
Proj Number	E-67	E-161	E-209	E-77	E-2	Ē-16	MR-41	MR-22	MR-22A	MR-57	CT26-H037. 038	E-204	E-164	E-23	E-56	E-137L	E-186	MR-32	MR-9	MR-111	E-160	E-55	E-30	E-193	다	E-68	E-153	C-11	E-12
CHFA Progress #	85005D	8600213	970050	85024D	85022D	85023D	85020D	85025D	85025Z	85021D	850280	770077	85051D	85052D	85053D	85054D	080068	85059	85060D	89007D	85069D	85067D	85088D	91135D	85101D	85102D	85103D	94063D	85107D
Project Address	115 South Montowese Street	3 Block Island Road	725 Pallsades Avenue	84 West Wooster Stret	67 Rocky Glen Road	25 Memorial Drive	86 Coalpit Hill Rd	1-60 Fairfield Ridge Rd	1-137 Mil Ridge Road	1-16 MIII Ridge Drive	80-87 Fairfield Ridge Rd	60 Main Street	16 Main Street	15 Pine Tree Lane	15 Pine Tree Lane	20 Trefoll Court	73-77 Vinci Drive	4-95 Bertolf Road	1-5 Armstrong Court	70 West Putnam Street	41 Boston Terrace	32 Guliford Court		101-500 Alberta Jagoe Court	45-56 Jepson Drive	101-111 Jepson Dr	24-90 DeMaia Drive	580 Milvitte Avenue	53 Conrad Street
Project Name(s)	Parkside VIII, I	Parkside VIII. II	Forest Green Homes	Crosby Manor	Glen Apartments	Glen Apartments	Coal Pit Hill	Fairfield Ridge	Mill Ridge	Mili Ridge Ext	Fairfield Ridge Rehab	Kirtland Commons	Essex Court	PineTree Apts.	PineTree Apts.	Trefoll Court	McKennay Terr. II	Adams Garden Apts	Armstrong Court	Manor at Byram I/McKlnney Terrace 1	Boston Terrace	Guilford Court	Guilford Court Ext	Alberta Jagoe Commons	C. McKeen Village	C. McKeen Village	DeMalo Gardens	Robert E. Hutt Cong	Oak Terrace
Sponsor	Branford Housing Authority	Branford Housing Authority	Bridgeport Housing Authority	Danbury Housing Authority	Danbury Housing Authority		Danbury Housing Authority	Danbury Housing Authority	Danbury Housing Authority			Deep River Housing Authority	Westford Management Co	Fairfield Housing Authority	Fairfield Housing Authority		The Manor at Byram II, Inc.	Greenwich Housing Authority	Greenwich Housing Authority	The Manor at Byram I. Inc.	Gullford Housing Authority	Gulfford Housing Authority	Gullford Housing Authority	Millard Housing Authority	Milford Housing Authority	Millord Housing Authority	Milford Housing Authority	Naugatuck Housing Authority	Naugatuck Housing Authority
Municipality		Branford	Bridgeport	Danbury	Danbury		Danbury	Danbury	Danbury			Deep River	Essex	Fairfield	Fairfloid		Greenwich	Greenwich	Greenwich	Greenwich	Guilford	Guilford	Gullford	Miford	Miltord	Milford	Milford	Naugatuck	Naugatuck
Men	르	±t,									. (.)					4 13,													

² State Housing Projects in Communities Represented by Members of the GAE Committee (by owner type, PHA, NP or FP)

ψS								1				ار	_		_	Ţ	1			1	1		1						
State House	0,	- 2	- 2	2	<u>۾</u>	143	7.2	77	27	98	98	64	137	137	140	117	31	22	15			25	551	148	148	145	20		107
State	52	15	Ð	15	11	98	ø	රා	Ó	12	12	52	×	25	25	14	55	92	æ	æ	18	88	27	27	27	27	5		24
109th Congress	e	e	က	က	m	4	-	-	-	m	E	4	4	4	4	es	-	-	-		-	4	٠,	4	7	4	-		S.
Census Tract	3454.00	3454,00	3454.00	3454.00	3453,00	351.00	4946,00	4945,00	4944.00	1861.00	1361.00	434.00	442.00	442.00	432,00	1571.00	4301.00	4304.00	4301,00	4306.01	4306.01	207.00	223.00	218.02	220.00	214.00	4962.00		2002.00
РМSA Name	Waterbury	Waterbury	Waterbury	Waterbury	Waterbury	Stamford - Norwalk	Hartford	Hartford	Hartford	New Haven - Menden	New Haven - Meriden	Stamford - Norwalk	Stamford - Norwalk	Stamford - Norwalk	Stamford - Norwalk	New Haven - Meriden	Hartford	Harford	Hartford	Hartford	Harford	Stamford - Norwalk	Hartford		Danbury				
County	NEW HAVEN	NEW HAVEN	NEW HAVEN	NEW HAVEN	NEW HAVEN	FAIRFIELD	HARTFORD	HARTFORD	HARTFORD	NEW HAVEN	NEW HAVEN	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	NEW HAVEN	HARTFORD	HARTFORD	HARTFORD	HARTFORD	HARTFORD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	HARTFORD		FAIRFIELD
, 58. 88.										_								-	_	_	_				4				
3BR 4BR				-						-		_				-		-						102	_	-		-	
28R			+		16	- 80						4		_	152 48									75	136 14	144 72			
18R	6		_		-	- 00	9	12		5		R	4		1	\$	9	16		12			23	-	14		10		
GB.R	8	18	8	36 4			8	7	19	28	24 6		4	22		4	24	24 1	32	28	15 5	8	28				30		4
Bitdg	80	er e			ф	α0	4	4	2	ω,	5	rs.		2 2	46		89	2		7	₀			93	27	e .	2		4
# of Units	ş	77	8	94	32	92	\$	\$	25	8	90	8	4	8	200	£	4	40	9	64	8	64	S	506	168	216	40		\$
Occup. Date	07/08/1967	01/10/1972	05/28/1975	01/01/1981	9/13/1958	11/1/1950	11/01/1981	03/17/1976	12/29/1987	03/01/1971	06/01/1983	30/1895	12/29/1995	05/21/1978	8/1/1951	10/1/1894	11/24/1974	04/10/1968	06/17/1985	11/22/1978	07/01/1980	8/29/1989	10/01/1965	12/30/1960	5/20/1949	12/1/1956	4/27/1978	. 4.	7/18/1985
Program	Elderly 0	Elderly	Elderly 0	Elderly 0	Mod Rental 9	Mod Rental	Elderty 1	Elderly 0	Elderly 1.	Elderly 0.	Elderly	Affordable Hsg 6/30/1995	Congregate 1:		Mod Rental Sec 8 Rehab 8	Congregate 1	Elderly 1	Elderly 0	Elderiy	Elderly 1	Elderly 0	Congregate 8	Elderly 1	Mod Rental	Mod Rental 5	Mod Rental	Elderly 4	-	Congregate 7
Proj Number	E-30	E-71	E-96	E-143	MR-61	MR-37	E-154	E-104	E-183	E-53	E-121/188	AH-15	C-26	E-116	MR-27	C-25	E-84	F-33	E-168	E-122	E-148	C-10	E -13	MR-68	MR-6	MR-55	£-118		C-7
CHFA Progress #	85108D	85109D	85110D	851110	85106D	85119D	85125D	851240	88047D	851310	851320	95094D	96083D	85135D	85136D	951010	85168D	85167D	85171D	85169D	851700	901160	85180D	851790	85177D	85178D	85216D		090058
Project Address	53 Conrad Street	53 Conrad Street	53 Conrad Street	53 Conrad Street	1-5 Lewis Circle	57 Milport Avenue	312-316 Cedar Street	241 West Hill Road	1 MIII Street Ext.	167-A Branford Rd	167 Branford Road	16 School Street	11 Rogers Square	1 Emerson Street	164 West Cedar	100 Red Cedar Road	408 Main Street	6 Carter Lane	43 Academy Street	500 Pleasant Street	500 Pleasant Street	28 Vine Street	186 Greenwich Avenue	22-238 Custard Street	51-163 Dale Street	42-74A Merrell Avenue	11 Grove Street		101 Simeon Rd,
Project Name(s)	Oak Terrace Ext	Oak Terrace Ext 5	Oak Terrace Ext 5	Oak Terrace Ext	Lewis Circle	Mill Apts	Cedar Village	Kallaher Park	New Meadow Village		Hillside Terrace Ext		Ludlow (Commons)Square Congregate	Ludlow Village	Coloniai Viliage	Silverbrook Estates	DICaprio Forgione Terrace	Gen, Pulaski Terrace	Lincoln Lewis Terrace 4	Zdunczyk Terrace 5	Zdunczyk Terrace Ext 5	Wormser Congregate	Edward Czescik Homes	Lawn Hill Terrace	Oak Park	Vidal Court	Elm Grove		Augustana/Bishop Curtis Homes
Sponsor	Naugatuck Housing Authority	Naugatuck Housing Authority C	Naugatuck Housing Authority	Naugatuck Housing Authority C	Naugatuck Housing Authority	New Canaan Housing Authority	Newington Housing Authority	Newington Housing Authority	Newington Housing Authority	North Branford Housing Authority Hillslde Terrace	North Branford Housing Authority	Norwalk Housing Authority	Norvalk Housing Authority	Norwalk Housing Authority	Norwalk Housing Authority	Town of Orange	Southington Housing Authority	Southington Housing Authority	Southington Housing Authority	Southington Housing Authority 2	Southington Housing Authority Z	Stamford Housing Authority	West Hartford Housing Authority		Diocese of Bridgepart				
Municipality	Naugatuck	Naugatuck	Naugatuck	Naugatuck	Naugatuck	New Canaan	Newlngton	Newlngton	Newington	North Branford	North Branford	Norwalk	Norwalk	Norwalk	Norwalk	Orange	Southington	Southington	Southington	Southington	Southington	Stamford	Stamford	Stamford	Stamford	Stamford	West Hartford		Bethel
Туре	垂	¥	НА	H.	¥	Ą	¥	¥	£	¥	돷	Ę	Ŧ	チ	Ŧ	НA	¥	¥	¥	¥	¥	¥	ş	HA	¥	Ŧ	£		롼

* State Housing Projects in Communities Represented by Members of the GAE Committee (by owner type, PHA, NP or FP)

Professor Prof	State	House	2 2	128	130	124	128	130	110	윮	150	85	82	24	24	24	24	23	ន	ន	137	137	140	145	145	\$	8		130	110
Particle	 		33 12	23	23	23	23	23	24	24	36	38	9	9	မှ	9	9	ę	9	9	25	25	25	27	27	5	5			24
Protection Pro			7	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	r)	5	5	5	5	5	4					-			4	22
Secretary Secr		1	8 8	8	8	9	8	8	8,	00.		9	8	00	00	00	00	00	8	00		 Q	Q	0	Q	00	8		Q	0
Bandered Bander Bergan, Control State Co	8	£ 10	702.0	738.0	706.0	744.0	716.0	709.0	2105	2107.	112.0	106.0	4166,	4157.	4171.	4159.	4155.	4187.	4185.	4165.	437.0	442,0	441.0	201.0	215.0	4976.	4974.		706.0	2101.00
Bellevier Bellevier Bellevier Bellevier Propert Proper		PMSA Name	Bridgeport	Bridgeport	Bridgeport	Bridgeport	Bridgeport	Bridgeport	Danbury	Danbury	Stamford - Norwalk	Stamford - Norwalk	Hartford	Harfford	Hartford	Hartford	Harfford	Hartford	Hartford	Hartford	Stamford - Norwalk	Stamford - Norwalk	Stamford - Norwalk	Stamford - Norwalk	Stamford - Norwalk	Hartford	Hardord		Bridgeport	Danbury
Electrical General Conference Project Learners	ļ	1 3 G	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	HARTFORD	HARTFORD	HARTFORD	HARTFORD	HARTFORD	HARTFORD	HARTFORD	HARTFORD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD	HARTFORD	HARTFORD		FAIRFIELD	FAIRFIELD
Executive District Control of the Control of th	 		-																-											_
Secretary Secr	 	% %		80						4						3		89		2					7					
Standard		ĕ								55		21					10		Ī											
Bringeron Program Pr		H.						-			83		82								80	જ		28			9		28	6
Project Marcology Proj		AB0			33	00																								
Bauchord Brandon House, Brandon, Brandon House, Brandon,									_			1	7					63	72	13				-,					-	_
Brantocal Brantocal Intercents Captures		# of Units	2	22	32	æ	4	12	19	ន	38	28	50	20	15	19	5	236	448	100	8	20	25	28	69	4	10		81	6
Beautor Beautorianiny Spensor Brajest Names Project Names Order Annual States of Part 1 Project September 144-150 Numb by Steet 45th 144-150 Number by Steep Number		Occup. Date 5/1/1991	09/01/1991	2/28/1992	4/5/1995	03/15/1994	08/28/1990	01/20/1992	9/1/1989		12/5/1988	11/1/1984	08/01/1962	9/1/1996	7/1/1992	7/12/1993	7/31/1991	6/16/1950	8/6/1954	1/1/1959	12/20/1990	3/15/1997	10/1/1992	***	1/15/1892	11/29/1990	12/13/1995		04/15/1992	7722/1986
Handergality Spender Spender Project Namers Project Namers Project Namers Spender Address Project Namers Spender Address Project Namers Spender Address Project Namers Spender	ć	Program Affordable Hsd	Affordable Hsg	Affordable Hsg	Homeless Hag	Homeless Hag	Homeless Hag	Limited Equity	Homeless Hsg	Mod Rental Sec 8 Rehab		MRD Section 8			Homeless Hsg	Limited Equity	Limited Equity	ľ	- 1	1	Affordable Hsg	- 1	Homeless Hag	Elderly		Limited Equity	Limited Equity			MRD Section 8 7/22/1986
Birdigeport Regional Monwhood Programs in Project Names) Birdigeport Regional Monwhood Programs in Project Names) Birdigeport Regional Monwhood Programs in Project Names (1-67 Par Street (2018) Birdigeport Regional Monwhood Programs in Project Names (1-67 Par Street (2018) Birdigeport Regional Monwhood Programs in Project Names (1-67 Par Street (2018) Birdigeport Hall Magiltochnood House, Inc. Read Street (1-67 Par Street (2018) Birdigeport American Programs in Project Names (1-67 Par Street (2018) Birdigeport American Programs in Project Names (1-67 Par Street (2018) Birdigeport American Programs in Project Names (1-67 Par Street (2018) Birdigeport American Programs in Project Names (1-67 Par Street (2018) Birdigeport American Programs (1-67 Par Street (2018) Birdigeport American Project Street (2-67 Par Street (2018) Birdigeport American Programs (1-67 Par Street (2-67 Par Street (2018)) Corenwich Advance (1-67 Par Street (2-67 P			AH-23	AH-1	93-09-07	93-09-01	015-HH-1	015-LEC-1	034-HH-1	C126-H045- 017	94-004-8	MRD-90L		057-	089-HH-1	089-LEC-7			MR-45	MR-64	AH-11									MRD-78L
Bridgeport Heims Housing in Heims Housing De Neget Manes) Freier Address Street Heims Housing in Carbiticopheron Heims Housing in Carbiticopheron Foundation Presidential Willings 6 40 Propect Street Geography in Carbiticopheron Foundation Housing in Carbiticopheron Housing in Read Street 170 Read Street Bridgeport County Investina Chara del Public in Carbiticopheron Housing Amore House 6 Cooperative, inc. Bridgeport County Investina Chara del Public in Carbiticopheron Housing Amore House 6 Cooperative, inc. Bridgeport County Investina Chara del Public in Carbiticopheron Housing Authority Bridge Drive Britain Chira del Public in Carbiticopheron Housing Authority Britain County Macroticopheron Housing Authority Britain County Macroticopheron County Manor Housing Authority Britain County Manor Housing Authority Britain County Manor Cooperative in Cooperative Britain Cooperative Cooperative Cooperative Cooperative Cooperative Cooperative Britain Cooperative Cooperative Britain Cooperative Britain Cooperative Cooperative Britain Cooperative Cooperative Britain Cooperative Cooper	CHFA	Progress #	1	92015D						[\neg												- 1	85027D
Bradenie Branker I Helms Housing, Inc. Bridgeport Helms Housing, Inc. Bridgeport Helms Housing, Inc. Bridgeport Housing, Inc. Bridgeport Housing, Inc. Bridgeport Housing, Inc. Bridgeport County MACTIVE Bridgeport Hall Neighborhood House, Inc. Bridgeport County MACTIVE Bridgeport Hall Neighborhood House, Inc. Bridgeport Hall Neighborhood House, Inc. Bridgeport County MACTIVE Bridgeport Hall Neighborhood House, Inc. Bridgeport St. Cooperative, Inc. Bridgeport Manos House, Inc. Bridgeport St. Cooperative Manos House, Inc. Greenwich Hill House, Inc. New Britain CHFA N		Project Address 146-190 North Iwy Street	36 Hope Street	61-67 Park Street	392 Prospect Street	170 Read Street	36 Catherine Street		34 Rocky Glen Road					137 Arch Street	241-249 Arch Street								100R South Main Street						,	317 Main Street
Branford Branford Interfaith Casition Bridgeport Hehms Housing, Inc. Bridgeport Technico-op Inc Development Bridgeport Foundation Bridgeport Technico-op Inc Development Bridgeport Technico-op Inc Development Bridgeport Caunty INACTIVE County INACTIVE Danbury Danbury Danbury Amos House, Inc. Creenwich Hill House, Inc. New Britain CHFA New Bri		. Name(s)															Willow Brook Estates Condos 4													The Godfrey
Bratford Bridgeport Creenwich Greenwich Greenwich New Britain		Sponsor Branford Interfaith Coalition	Helms Housing, Inc.	TechniCo-op Inc. Development Foundation	Regional Networkof Programs, Inc.			Nuestra Casa del Pueblo, Inc	Amos House, Inc.	Danbury Housing Authority LP	Hill House, Inc.	Town Hall Annex LP c/o Greenwich HA	СНҒА		Friendship Service Center, Inc.		South Main Street Coop				Ì									Nolan Enterprises
8	e de la constante de la consta	municipality Branford			Bridgeport			Bridgeport	Danbury	Danbury			New Britain	New Britain	New Britain	New Britain	New Britain	New Britain	New Britain	New Britain	Norwalk	Norwalk				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			Bridgeport	Danbury
	,		£	윤	윤	윤	φ	ď	2	Ğ.	Š.	호	윤	윤	Ş.	9-	윤		<u>8</u>	<u>P</u>	호	身	윤	용	dy.	Đ.	Q.			

State	26	24	041	
State	ė,	9	25	
109th Congress	5	5	4	
Census	4160.00	4182.00	434,00	
PMSA Name	Hardord	Hartford	Stamford - Norwalk	
County	HARTFORD	HARTFORD	FAIRFIELD	
5BR				. '^
488		2		25
388	2	83.		53
ZBR	83	æ	13	529 749,1 106 1,647 625
18R	ம	4	5	1,106
08R		·		 7,70,1
Bidg	-			 677
# of Units	99	3	ਝ	4,615
Occup. Date # of Units	5/30/1985	1/20/1984	11/1/1994	
	Mod Rental Developers 5/30/1985			
Proj Number	5	MRD-976L 8/FHA Ins	94-017-03 Prime	
CHFA Progress # Proj N	911610	85116D		
Project Address	370 High Street	135 West Street	15 School Street	
Project Name(s)		Talcott Gardens	River Commons	
Бропзог	New Britain The Crowninshield Mgml Corp Washington School	New Britain Related Monagement Co.	Richmond Group	
Municipality	New Britain	New Britain	Norwalk	,

ype

Attachment B

Consequence of Loss of State-aided units on Affordable Housing Appeals List

	And the second s			-				Adjusted
	2000 Census	Governmentally	CHFA	Deed	lotal		State-aided	Percent for
TOWNS	Units	Assisted Units	Mortgages	Restricted	Assisted	Percent	units	loss of State-
				OIIIIS	OIIIIS			aided units
Bridgeport	54367	8587	988	11	9484	17.44%	171	17.13%
Danbury	28519	2463	278	195	2936	10.29%	514	8.49%
New Britain	31164		1165	3	5458	17.51%	1038	14.18%
Norwalk	33753	3012	245	561	3818	11.31%	425	,
Stamford	47317	5288	284	1229	6801	14.37%	777	12.73%
West Haven	22336		399	0	2643	11.83%	0	11.83%
Berlin	6955		81	9	467	7.10%	0	7.10%
Bethel	6653		24	62	334	5.02%	44	4.36%
Branford	13342	255	179	0	434	3.25%	06	2.58%
Chester	1613	26	2	0	33	2.05%	0	2.05%
Deep River	1910	30	17	0	47	2.46%	26	1.10%
Durham	2349	34	6	0	43	1.83%	0	1.83%
East Haven	11698		310	0	831	7.10%	0	7.10%
Essex	2977	37	5	0	42	1.41%	36	
Fairfield	21029		28	110	414	1.97%	89	
Greenwich	24511	1173	3	54	1230	5.02%	362	
Guilford	8724	169	31	0	200	2.29%	06	
Haddam	2822	23	13	0	36	1.28%	0	1.28%
Killingsworth	2283	0	4	5	6	0.39%	0	0.39%
Milford	21962	1015	226	107	1348	6.14%	135	
Naugatuck	12341	908	324	0	1129	9.15%	262	
New Canaan	7141	145	2	31	178	2.49%	16	
Newington	12264	488	411	36	935	7.62%	106	6.76%
North Branford	5246	99	62	0	128	2.44%	09	1.30%
Orange	4870	45	0	0	54	1.11%	45	0.18%
Sherman	1606	0	-	0	1	0.06%	0	0.06%
Southington	15557	650	291	51	892	6.38%	180	5.22%
West Hartford	25332	1228	341	230	1799	7.10%	54	%68.9
Wilton	6113		2	69	163	2.67%	0	2.67%

Attachment C



Appendix 10 - CAPITAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES

Capital Needs Assessment (CNA) Report, if rehabilitation work is involved – a physical assessment conducted by licensed professionals in their respective fields of all building components not to be replaced during the renovation. CNA requirements include the following:

- The qualifications of the professionals who prepare the report. The CNA consultant(s) must be Connecticut-licensed Architects and/or Engineers. The CNA report must include the author's observations and assessments based upon physical observations of the building exterior and interior, including mechanical and accessible spaces, attics, roofs, crawl spaces, etc. Any spaces not accessed shall be noted in the report.
- 2. The report must include a narrative description of the development, including the evaluator's overall assessment of the property condition. The narrative shall include property location, age, physical attributes, number of units inspected and the physical condition of the units inspected. The assessment shall address the presence, or suspected presence, of environmental hazards, such as asbestos, lead paint or mold.
- 3. Photographs supporting the findings in the report, including site and building characteristics that accurately reflect the existing conditions present, and shall further examine and analyze:
- a. The site, including general topography, ground water drainage, bituminous / concrete pavement, bituminous / concrete walks and curbs, site amenities, water, storm, sanitary sewer, gas and electric services.
- b. The structural system, both for substructures and super-structure, including exterior wall systems, doors and windows, roofing system and drainage.
- c. Common area and unit interiors, including existing finishes (carpet, vinyl wall covering, paint, VCT, ceramic tile, etc.) appliances, cabinets, toilet fixtures, exhaust fans, range hoods, etc.
- 4. Building mechanical systems including HVAC systems, plumbing and domestic hot water, fire protection systems, electrical lighting and power systems, communication and security systems, etc.
- 5. Any components which are non-compliant for ADA, Section 504 or the Fair Housing Guidelines. The report shall include a copy of an ADA design conformance consultant's certification that the specific development complies with all of the ADA and 504 regulations. If the ADA consultant is unable to certify compliance, the report shall include recommendations to the Owner for achieving compliance.
- 6. The report shall include an interview with on-site property management and maintenance personnel to gain knowledge of past repairs, pending repairs and chronic physical deficiencies. The consultant shall obtain and include a 5-year history of the Owner's capital repair expenditures for the development.
- 7. The estimated costs associated with delineated needs, including a budget and an in-depth scope of work for the work proposed. This budget shall include expenditures and costs for all property improvements that may affect the project's future marketability. Improvements may include adding central air to the development, community room additions, etc.
- 8. The report shall include a spreadsheet that outlines, by line item, the costs of proposed improvements expensed in year one, with a life-cycle replacement budget reflecting appropriate line item costs expensed over the proposed mortgage term. The spreadsheet shall show all costs in today's dollars, with an appropriate rate of inflation for costs expended over the life-cycle term.
- 9. In the case of a complete gutting of buildings, a structural needs assessment report (to adhere to the latest applicable codes) by a structural engineer and architectural need-assessment report (to maintain functional and aesthetic integrity of such component) by an architect. The reports shall include the age, the material, the condition and life expectancy for such component.